

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 RICHARD EVANS,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 R. MILAN; FNU LEFFMAN; S.
15 SHERMAN,

16 Defendants.

Case No. 1:20-cv-70-AWI-HBK

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER AND
MOTION FOR INTERVIEW

(Doc. Nos. 39, 51)

17 Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for a protective order, filed September 14,
18 2020. (Doc. No. 39, "Protective Motion). Also pending is Plaintiff's one-page letter addressed to
19 "Captain Kuehn (SATF F-Yard)" requesting an interview to discuss the condition of his
20 confinement that was filed as a motion on November 6, 2020. (Doc No. 51 at 1, "Motion for
21 Interview").

22 In his Protective Motion, Plaintiff seeks a protective order for himself. (Doc. No. 39 at 1).
23 Without stating any facts, Plaintiff claims he needs protection from the Court because he will be a
24 witness in this case and will be subjected to harassment and retaliation for filing this action
25 because prison officials will want to deter or scare him. (*Id.*). On August 25, 2020, the Court
26 denied Plaintiff's previous motion for protective order explaining the such motion are reserved
27 for discovery. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(2)(B).

28 In the Letter Motion, Plaintiff states he would like an interview with the Captain, "to

1 discuss 'conditions of confinement' issue on SATF F-Yard." (*See* Doc. No. 51). Plaintiff seeks
2 no relief from the Court. (*Id.*). Although filed as a Motion, the pleading improper. *See* Fed. R.
3 Civ. P. 7(b). To the extent Plaintiff wishes to raise any concerns with correctional officials, he
4 should follow prison protocols and the administrative grievance procedures and refrain from
5 copying the Court on correspondence with correctional officials.

6 As set forth in the Court's July 12, 2021 Order, screening under § 1915 remains pending
7 on Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint. (Doc. No. 118 at 1; *see also* docket). This case remains
8 in the early stages of litigation. (*Id.*). Service of process has not been directed on any
9 defendants. (*See* docket).

10 Accordingly, it is ORDERED:

11 Plaintiff's motion for a protective order (Doc. No. 39) and motion to interview (Doc. No.
12 51) are DENIED.

13
14 Dated: July 12, 2021


HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE